



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,532	01/16/2002	Victoria M.E. Bellotti	110143	7732

27074 7590 08/06/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

4

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

fr

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/683,532	JAN, 16, 2002	BELLOTTI et al	11-143

EXAMINER	
CHoudhury, Azizul	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) AZIZUL CHOUDHURY (3) YONG CHOI (43,324)
(2) WILLIAM VAUGHN (4) Ronald Pawlikowski

Date of Interview JULY 28, 2004

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: AGENDA

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 10, 21, 23

Identification of prior art discussed: SAKAGUCHI et al (US 6,594,636 B1)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

In discussions with regards to the prior art, the applicant's representatives felt it did not point out the placement of the network address. In addition, the placement is in two different parts of the email. The arguments will be taken into consideration but, no agreement has been reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

AC

Will C Vaughn
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

Application No. 09/683,532

AGENDA

Sakaguchi does not disclose or suggest a method for transmitting workflow-enabled electronic mail messages from a user of a workflow system to a recipient including at least embedding a link to a determined network address in an email message to the recipient, associating a process of the workflow system with the determined network address, and sending the email message having the link to the determined network address to the recipient, as recited in independent claim 1.

Sakaguchi does not disclose or suggest a method for transmitting workflow-enabled electronic mail messages from a user of a workflow system to a recipient including at least incorporating a determined email response address into an email message to the recipient, associating a process of the workflow system with the determined email response address, and sending the email message having the incorporated email response address to the recipient, as recited in independent claim 10.

Sakaguchi does not disclose or suggest a method for accessing a workflow process using a workflow-enabled email message including at least receiving the workflow-enabled email message that includes a link to a network address associated with a workflow process, wherein the network address is specific to the workflow process and to the email message, selecting the link to access the network address, wherein, in response, the workflow system provides access to the workflow process, as recited in independent claim 21.

Sakaguchi does not disclose or suggest a method for providing access to a workflow process in response to receiving a network address that is associated with the workflow process including at least determining if a user from which a network address is received is a valid user of that network address, and providing access to the user to the workflow process only if user

Application No. 09/683,532

from which the network address is received is determined to be a valid user of that network
address, as recited in independent claim 23.